

Paxton asks the Court to consolidate this case with *Pluecker et al. v. Paxton et al.*, Case No. 1:18-cv-1100-RP because they are “essentially the same case,” raising common legal issues with slightly different factual circumstances. (Mot. Consolidate, Dkt. 14, at 4). Because the Amawi case was first filed, the interests of justice and judicial economy warrant consolidating Pluecker with this case. (*Id.*). In her notice withdrawing opposition, Amawi advised the Court that she did not oppose consolidation, provided that Amawi and the *Pluecker* plaintiffs may file separate reply briefs to the Attorney General’s omnibus opposition to their respective preliminary injunction motions. (Not. Withdrawing Opp., Dkt. 21, at 1). The Attorney General does not oppose separate reply briefs. (*Id.*).

The Court agrees that these two cases involve a common question of law and similar if not identical issues of fact. Absent consolidation, the briefing in these two cases is likely to be highly duplicative, which risks unnecessary costs and delay. Further, the Court is aware of no reason that consolidation would prejudice the rights of the parties. *See St. Bernard*, 712 F.2d at 989. The Court also appreciates that consolidation is unopposed and that the parties have made a good faith effort to resolve this question. In light of all of these considerations, the Court concludes that consolidation is proper pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42.

Accordingly, the unopposed Motion to Consolidate, (Dkt. 14), is **GRANTED**. it is **ORDERED** that this matter, Case No. 1:18-cv-1091-RP, is hereby **CONSOLIDATED** with *Pluecker et al. v. Paxton et al.*, Case No. 1:18-cv-1100-RP. The Court further orders that this case, *Amawi v. Pflugerville Independent School District et al.*, Case No. 1:18-CV-1091-RP is **DESIGNATED** as the lead case, and all further filings should be made in that cause number.

SIGNED on January 15, 2019.



ROBERT PITMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE